



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_46267
Title of the Manuscript:	Vitamin D and obesity in adult populations in Egypt: the vitamin inadequacy in association with visceral fat distribution
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link: (<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Introduction: 1) The introduction is unnecessarily long and protracted. Although, it contains much information like the literature review of a thesis work, but it is not suitable for an original article. All parts of the introduction must be shortened substantially.	Done
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: 1) Please replace 'have been' with 'were' in the line no. 17 2) Please add 'were' at the given place 3) Please add 'was' at given place. 4) Please change the phrase as indicated in the line no. 22. 5) Please add 'with' as highlighted in the line no. 23 6) Please add 'method' as indicated in the line no. 38. 7) Please improve the English grammar and composition. Methods: 1) In the line no. 290 'sees' should be replaced by 'sexes'	Done Done Done Done Cannot be done. The BMI you are referring to here 28.8(13) is that for men, not for women; while BMI 25.4(4) is that for women. The sentence is an explanation for the previous sentence, not in continuation with the sentence before. Note the "colon" before the BMI number. Done Done
Optional/General comments	The paper is overall interesting and conveys important notions about Vitamin D distribution in obese patients. It may be accepted after the necessary corrections as noted above.	Appreciated

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	